



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,747	12/18/2001	Carlos R. Araya	SP00-375	5361
22928	7590	01/22/2003		
CORNING INCORPORATED SP-TI-3-1 CORNING, NY 14831			EXAMINER	
			FIORILLA, CHRISTOPHER A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1731		

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003

S

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A5-3

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/029,747	ARAYA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Christopher A. Fiorilla	1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ .
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_ .  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                     | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                                   |

Art Unit: 1731

1. Claim 12 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 12 allows for up to 5 times the power density at the boundary than in the bulk while claim 1 limits this value to 1.5.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

It is submitted that the disclosure does not contain sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention. The disclosure teaches that green bodies are placed in proximity to adjacent ones such that upon heating each green body is subject to no more than about 1.5 times the power density at the boundary than at the bulk, but the specification does not teach how this is done. There is no guidance with respect to the shape of the bodies, the distance between bodies, the stacking arrangement, etc.. The test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation. See MPEP 2164.01.

The following factors have been considered in determining that the disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and that necessary experimentation is "undue." These factors include, but are not limited to:

Art Unit: 1731

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;
- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

It is submitted that the claims are very broad, most not being directed to a specific composition, shape or specific article orientation. Again, little direction is provided by the inventor with respect to the proximity of the bodies. No working examples are provided to guide one skilled in the art to carry out the invention. The quantity of experimentation needed to use the invention based on the content of the disclosure would be enormous because the claims do not limit the materials or the configuration of the bodies.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson et al. (5,202,541) in view of Wu (5,538,681).

Patterson et al. teaches the basic claimed process of heating a plurality of ceramic workpieces. The process disclosed by Patterson et al. includes placing each one of a plurality of green bodies in proximity to an adjacent one of said plurality of green bodies and heating the green bodies utilizing microwave energy. Patterson et al. also discloses that the proximity of adjacent bodies is a distance of no more than about  $\frac{1}{2}$  the wavelength of the microwave energy. This can be concluded from the microwave frequency of 2.45 GHz (i.e 12.2 cm wavelength), the dimensions of the crucible (i.e. 90mm- col. 5, line 19), Figure 1 and the description of the arrangement of the components at col. 5. Note that Patterson et al. also discloses that the assembly therein produces conditions close to isothermal (col. 2, line 7).

Patterson et al. does not specifically disclose drying the ceramic materials but discloses that the heating may be used to drive a physical or chemical reaction.

Wu discloses that microwaves may be used to dry ceramic green bodies including forming aids and vehicle. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the assembly of Patterson to dry ceramic green bodies as taught by Wu in view of the generic disclosure of Patterson et al.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Fiorilla whose telephone number is 703-308-0674. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 703-308-1164. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7718 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.



**Christopher A. Fiorilla  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1731**